

DEC 28 2007

CATHY A. CATTERSON, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

MARTHA GREGORIO,

Petitioner,

v.

MICHAEL B. MUKASEY, ** Attorney
General,

Respondent.

No. 06-72858

Agency No. A75-769-883

MEMORANDUM *

On Petition for Review of an Order of the
Board of Immigration Appeals

Submitted December 20, 2007***

Before: GOODWIN, WALLACE, and HAWKINS, Circuit Judges.

* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

** Michael B. Mukasey is substituted for his predecessor, Alberto R. Gonzales, as Attorney General of the United States, pursuant to Fed. R. App. P. 43(c)(2).

*** The panel unanimously finds this case suitable for decision without oral argument. See Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

Martha Gregorio seeks review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals (“BIA”) upholding an immigration judge’s order denying her application for cancellation of removal. We dismiss the petition for review.

We lack jurisdiction to review the BIA’s discretionary determination that Gregorio failed to show exceptional and extremely unusual hardship to a qualifying relative. *See Romero-Torres v. Ashcroft*, 327 F.3d 887, 892 (9th Cir. 2003).

Gregorio’s contention that the agency deprived her of due process by misapplying the law to the facts of her case does not state a colorable due process claim. *See Martinez-Rosas v. Gonzales*, 424 F.3d 926, 930 (9th Cir. 2005) (“[T]raditional abuse of discretion challenges recast as alleged due process violations do not constitute colorable constitutional claims that would invoke our jurisdiction.”); *see also Sanchez-Cruz v. INS*, 255 F.3d 775, 779 (9th Cir. 2001) (holding that the “misapplication of case law” may not be reviewed).

PETITION FOR REVIEW DISMISSED.